arXiv:1603.06364v2 [math.SP] 3 Apr 2016

Spectral Asymptotics for Fractional Laplacians

Victor Ivrii

April 5, 2016

Abstract

In this article we consider fractional Laplacians which seem to be of interest to probability theory. This is a rather new class of operators for us but our methods works (with a twist, as usual). Our main goal is to derive a two-term asymptotics as one-term asymptotics is easily obtained by R. Seeley's method.

In this section we consider fractional Laplacians.

This is a rather new class of operators for us but our methods works (with a twist, as usual). Our main goal is to derive a two-term asymptotics as one-term asymptotics is rather easily obtained by R. Seeley's method.

1 Problem set-up

Let us consider a bounded domain $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with the smooth boundary $\partial X \in \mathscr{C}^\infty$ [1]. In this domain we consider a fractional Laplacian $\Lambda_m = (\Delta^{m/2})_{\mathsf{D}}$ with $m > 0$ originally defined on functions $u \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : u|_{\partial X} = 0$ by

$$\Lambda_{m,X} := (\Delta^{m/2})_{\mathsf{D}} u = R_X \Delta^{m/2}(\theta_X u) \tag{1.1}$$

where θ_X is a characteristic function of X, R_X is an operator of restriction to X and $\Delta^{m/2}$ is a standard pseudodifferential operator in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the Weyl symbol $g(x,\xi)^{m/2}$ where as usual g is non-degenerate Riemannian metrics.

[1] Alternatively consider a bounded domain X on the Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{X}$.

Remark 1.1. (i) We consider $\Lambda_{m,X}$ as an unbounded operator in $\mathscr{L}^2(X)$ with domain $\mathfrak{D}(\Lambda_{m,X}) = \{u \in \mathscr{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathsf{supp}(u) \subset \bar{X}, R_X \Lambda_m \in \mathscr{L}^2(X)\} \subset \mathscr{H}_0^{m/2}(X)$.

(ii) This operator can also be introduced through positive quadratic form with domain $\{u \in \mathscr{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathsf{supp}(u) \subset \bar{X}\}$ and is a positive self-adjoint operator which is Friedrichs extension of operator originally defined on $\mathscr{H}_0^m(X)$.

(iii) We can consider this operator as a bounded operator from $\mathscr{H}_0^{m/2}(X)$ to $\mathscr{H}^{-m/2}(X) := \mathscr{H}_0^{-m/2\,*}(X)$.

(iv) Let $0 < m \notin 2\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathfrak{D}(\Lambda_{m,X}) \subset \mathscr{H}^m(X)$ if and only if $m \in (0,1)$; otherwise even eigenfunctions of $\Lambda_{m,X}$ may not belong to $\mathscr{H}^m(X)$.

(v) Since Λ_m does not possess transmission property as $m \notin 2\mathbb{Z}$, we are not in the framework of the Boutet-de-Monvel algebra, but pretty close: Λ_m possess μ-transmission property introduced by L. Hörmander and systematically studied by G. Grubb in [G1, G2]. We provide definition in Subsection 6.B.

We are interested in the asymptotics of the eigenvalue counting function $\mathsf{N}(\lambda)$ for $\Lambda_{m,X}$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$.

2 Preliminary analysis

As usual we reduce problem to a semiclassical one. Let $A = h^m \Lambda_{m,X} - 1$ with $h = \lambda^{-1/m}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\bar{x} \in X$, $B(\bar{x}, 2\gamma) \subset X$, $\gamma \geq h$. Then*

$$|e(x,x,0) - \mathsf{Weyl}(x)| \leq Ch^{1-d}\gamma^{-1} \qquad \forall x \in B(\bar{x},\gamma) \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$|\int \psi((x-\bar{x})/\gamma)\Big(e(x,x,0) - \mathsf{Weyl}(x)\Big)\,dx| \leq Ch^{1-d}\gamma^{d-1}\big(\gamma^{\delta} + h^{\delta}\gamma^{-\delta}\big) \tag{2.2}$$

as $\psi \in \mathscr{C}_0^{\infty}(B(0,1))$ and $\delta > 0$.

Proof. Estimate (2.1) is easily proven by just rescaling as modulo $O(h^s\gamma^{-s})$ we get a $\hbar$-pseudodifferential operator with $\hbar = h\gamma^{-1}$.

Estimate (2.2) is easily proven by rescaling plus R. Seeley's method as described in Subsection 7.5.1 of [Ivr]. We leave easy details to the reader.□

Then we immediately arrive to

Corollary 2.2. *(i) Contribution of the inner zone* $\{x : \mathsf{dist}(x, \partial X) \ge h\}$ *to the Weyl remainder does not exceed* Ch^{1-d}.

(ii) Contribution of the intermediate strip $\{x : \varepsilon \ge \mathsf{dist}(x, \partial X) \ge \varepsilon^{-1}h\}$ *to the Weyl remainder does not exceed* $\eta(\varepsilon)h^{1-d}$ *with* $\eta(\varepsilon) \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Here and in what follows $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant.

Proposition 2.3. *The following estimate holds:*

$$|e(x, x, 0)| \le Ch^{-d}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. The standard proof we leave to the reader. □

Theorem 2.4. *(i) For operator* A *Weyl remainder in the asymptotics for* N^- *does not exceed* Ch^{1-d}.

(ii) For operator $\Lambda_{m,X}$ *the following asymptotics holds*

$$\mathsf{N}(\lambda) = \kappa_0\lambda^{\frac{d}{m}} + O(\lambda^{\frac{d-1}{m}}) \qquad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to +\infty \tag{2.4}$$

where $\kappa_0 = (2\pi)^{-d}\varpi_d\,\mathsf{vol}(X)$ *and* $\mathsf{vol}(X)$ *means the Riemannian volume of* X.

Proof. Statement (i) follows immediately from Corollary 2.2(i) and Proposition 2.3. Statement (ii) follows immediately from (i) as $d \ge 2$. □

This was easy but recovering the second term is a much more daunting task requiring first to improve the contribution of the near boundary strip $\{x : \mathsf{dist}(x, \partial X) \le \varepsilon^{-1}h\}$ and also of the inner zone $\{x : \mathsf{dist}(x, \partial X) \ge \varepsilon\}$.

3 Propagation of singularities near boundary

Without any loss of the generality one can assume that

$$X = \{x : x_1 > 0\}, \qquad g^{jk} = \delta_{1j} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, d. \tag{3.1}$$

First let us study the propagation of singularities along the boundary:

Theorem 3.1. *On the energy level* $\tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon_0$

(i) x' *singularities propagate with the speed not exceeding* c *with respect to* (x', ξ').

(ii) As $|\xi'| \asymp \rho \ge Ch^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta}$ *singularities move from* $x' = y'$ *with the speed* $\asymp \rho$ *with respect to* x.

Proof. The proof is standard as it involves only pseudodifferential operators $p(x, hD')$ and their commutators with A but one can see easily that those commutators do not bring any troubles as the energy level is $\asymp 1$. We leave all easy details to the reader. □

Corollary 3.2. *(i) Let* $\rho \ge Ch^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta}$, $h^{1-\delta} \le \gamma \le \epsilon$. *Then the contribution of the zone* $\{(x, \xi') : x_1 \le \gamma, |\xi'| \asymp \rho\}$ *to the Tauberian remainder with* $T \in (T_*(\rho), T^*(\rho),\ T_*(\rho) = h^{1-\delta}\rho^{-2},\ T^*(\rho) = \epsilon\rho$ *does not exceed*

$$C\rho^{d-1}h^{-d} \times \gamma \times h^{1-\delta}\rho^{-2} \times \rho^{-1}. \tag{3.2}$$

(ii) The total contribution of the zone $\{(x, \xi') : x_1 \le \gamma = h^{1-\delta}\}$ *to the Tauberian error with* $T = h^{1-3\delta}$ *does not exceed* $Ch^{-d+1+\delta}$.

Proof. The easy and standard proof of Statement (i) is left to the reader.

Then the contribution of the zone $x_1 \le h^{1-\delta}$, $|\xi'| \ge Ch^{\delta}$ to the Tauberian remainder with $T = h^{1-3\delta}$ does not exceed $Ch^{-d+1+\delta}$. Since the contribution of the zone $\{(x, \xi') : x_1 \le \gamma = h^{1-\delta}, |\xi'| \le Ch^{2\delta}\}$ to the asymptotics does not exceed $C\rho^{d-1}h^{-d} \times \gamma \le Ch^{-d+1+\delta}$ we arrive to Statement (ii). □

Therefore in this zone $\{(x, \xi') : x_1 \le \gamma = h^{1-\delta}\}$ all we need is to pass from the Tauberian asymptotics to Weyl ones.

However the inner zone should be reexamined and we need to describe what happens with the propagation along Hamiltonian trajectory in the zone $\{(x, \xi) : x_1 \le h^{1-\delta}\}$. We can assume that $|\xi_1| \ge \varepsilon$ since the measure

of the remaining trajectories is small, here $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant.

4 Reflection of singularities from the boundary

4.1 Pilot model

We start from the pilot-model which will be used to prove the main case. Namely, let us consider 1-dimensional operator on half-line $\mathbb{R}^+$ with Euclidean metrics

$$B := B_{m,a,h} = ((h^2 D_x^2 + a^2)^{m/2})_{\mathsf{D}} \tag{4.1}$$

with $a \geq 0$. We denote $\mathbf{e}_{m,a,h}(x_1, y_1, \tau)$ the Schwartz kernel of its spectral projector.

Observe that scaling $x \mapsto x\gamma^{-1}$, $\tau \mapsto \tau\rho^{-m}$ transforms operator to one with $h \mapsto h/(\rho\gamma)$, $\tau \mapsto \tau\rho^{-m}$; because of this we can assume that $h = 1$ and the second scaling implies that we can assume that either $a = 1$ or $\tau = 1$.

Proposition 4.1. *(i) The spectrum of operator $\Lambda_{m,a}$ is absolutely continuos and it coincides with $[a^m, \infty)$.*

(ii) The following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{e}_{m,a,h}(x, y, \lambda) = \mathbf{e}_{m,1,ha^{-1}}(ax, ay, \lambda a^{-m}) = \\ \lambda^{1/m}\mathbf{e}_{m,a\lambda^{-1/m},h}(\lambda^{1/m}x, \lambda^{1/m}y, 1) = a\mathbf{e}_{m,1,h}(ax, ay, \lambda a^{-m}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\psi \in \mathscr{C}_0^\infty([-1,1])$, $\psi_\gamma(x) = \psi(x/\gamma)$ and $\phi \in \mathscr{C}_0^\infty([-1,1])$, $0 \leq a \leq 1 - \tau 0$. Then as $\gamma \geq h^{1-\delta}$, $T \geq C_0\gamma$, $h^\delta \geq \eta \geq h^{1-\delta}T^{-1}$*

$$\|\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t - 1)\psi_\gamma e^{i(mh)^{-1}tB}\psi_\gamma|_{t=T}\| \leq CT^{-1}\gamma + Ch^{\delta'}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Observe first that if for u supported in $\mathbb{R}^+$ and $L = x_1 hD_1 - ih/2 = L^*$

$$\operatorname{Re} i(BLu, u) = \frac{1}{2}(i[B, L]u, u) \tag{4.4}$$

and then

$$\operatorname{Re}(Lu, u_t - ih^{-1}Bu) = \frac{1}{2}(ih^{-1}[B, L]u, u) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_t \operatorname{Re}(Lu, u) \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re}(ktu + Lu, u_t - ih^{-1}Bu) = \frac{1}{2}\partial_t\big(kt\|u\|^2 + (Lu, u)\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big((ih^{-1}[B, L]u, u) - k\|u\|^2\big). \tag{4.6}$$

Let us plug

$$u = \phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t - 1)e^{ih^{-1}TB}\psi_\gamma v \tag{4.7}$$

with $\|v\| = 1$. Then the left hand expression in (4.6) is 0 and

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t\big(kt\|u\|^2 + (Lu, u)\big) \le \frac{1}{2}\big(-(ih^{-1}[B, L]u, u) + k\|u\|^2\big). \tag{4.8}$$

Let us estimate from above the right-hand expression; obviously

$$ih^{-1}[B_m, L] = m(B_m - a^2 B_{m-2}). \tag{4.9}$$

(a) Assume first that $m > 2$. Then since

$$(1 - C\eta)\|u\| \le \|B_m u\| \le (1 + C\eta)\|u\| \tag{4.10}$$

due to cutoff by ϕ and

$$B_{m-2} \le B_m^{(m-2)/m} \tag{4.11}$$

in virtue of Corollary 6.2 we conclude that as $k = m(1 - a^2)$ the right-hand expression does not exceed $C\eta$ and therefore

$$m(1 - a^2)t\|u\|^2 + (Lu, u) \le C\gamma + C\eta T \tag{4.12}$$

since the value of the left-hand expression as $t = 0$ does not exceed $C\gamma$.

On the other hand, observe that on the energy levels from $(1-C_0\eta, 1+C_0\eta)$ the singularities propagate with a speed (with respect to x_1) not exceeding $m(1 - a^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + C_0\eta)$. Therefore we conclude that u is negligible as $|x_1| \ge m(1 - a^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + C_0\eta)T + C\gamma$ and therefore since

$$\|D_1 u\| \le (B_2 u, u) \le ((1 - a^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_0\eta) \tag{4.13}$$

we conclude using (4.10) and (4.11) that

$$|(Lu,u)| \le m(1-a^2+C_0\eta)T + C\gamma - \epsilon_0 T\|\psi_\gamma(x_1)u\|^2 \tag{4.14}$$

and the left-hand expression of (4.12) is greater than $\epsilon_0 T\|\psi_\gamma u\|^2 - C(\eta T+\gamma)$ and we arrive to (4.3).

(b) Assume now that $0<m<2$. Then our above proof fails short in both estimating $\mathsf{Re}\, ih^{-1}([B,L]u,u)$ from below and $|(Lu,u)|$ from above and we need to remedy it.

First, away from $x_1=0$ only symbols are important and therefore the right-hand expression of (4.8) does not exceed $\frac{m}{2}(a^m-a^2)\|\psi_\sigma u\|^2 + Ch^2\sigma^{-2}$ since $\|B_{m-2}\|\le a^{m-2}$. Indeed, we need just to decompose $1=\psi_\sigma^2+\psi_\sigma'^2$ and use our standard arguments to rewrite the right-hand expression of (4.8) as the sum of the same expressions for $\psi_\sigma u$ and $\psi'_\sigma u$ plus $Ch^2\sigma^{-2}\|u\|^2\|$.

Similarly we deal $\mathsf{Re}(Lu,u)=\mathsf{Re}(L\psi_\sigma u,\psi_\sigma u)+\mathsf{Re}(L\psi'_\sigma u,\psi'_\sigma u)$ and the absolute value of the second term does not exceed $m(1-a^2)^{\frac12}T\|B_m^{1/m}\psi'_\sigma\|^2$.

We claim that

$$\mathsf{Re}(L\psi_\sigma u,\psi_\sigma u)\le C\sigma\|\psi_\sigma u\|^2 + C\sigma h^\delta; \tag{4.15}$$

we prove it late but now instead of (4.12) we arrive as $\sigma=\epsilon_0 t$ to

$$((1-a^2)-\epsilon)P(T)\le Ch^{\delta'} + (a^m-a^2)T^{-1}\int_\gamma^T P(t)\,dt + C\gamma T^{-1}$$

with $P(t)=\|\psi_{\epsilon_0 t}u(.,t)\|^2$. Then since $\nu=(a^m-a^2)/((1-a^2)-\epsilon)<0$ which implies (4.3) again. □

Proof of (4.15). Indeed, as $h=1$, $\|B_m^{1/m}u\|\le 1$ we from G. Grubb [G1, G2] conclude that $|u(x_1)|\le Cx_1^{(m-1)/2}\|uB_m^{1/m}u\|$ and $|Lu(x_1)|\le Cx_1^{(m-1)/2}$ and therefore $|(Lu,u)|\le C\sigma^m\|B_m^{1/m}u\|^2$. Take $\sigma=1$.

Scaling returns (4.15) as $\sigma=h$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\Lambda=\Lambda_{m,X}$ be a d-dimensional operator* (1.1) *on the half-space $X=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d, x_1>0\}$ with Euclidean metrics ($d\ge 2$) and $A=h^m\Lambda^m-1$.*

Let $\psi \in \mathscr{C}_0^\infty([-1,1])$, $\psi_\gamma(x) = \psi(x_1/\gamma)$, $\phi \in \mathscr{C}_0^\infty([-1,1])$, $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$ supported in $\{|\xi'| \le 1-\epsilon\}$ with $\epsilon > 0$. Finally, let $\gamma \ge h^{1-\delta}$, $T \ge Ch^{-\delta}\gamma$, $h^\delta \ge \eta \ge h^{1-\delta}T^{-1}$. Then

$$\|\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t)\varphi(hD')\psi_\gamma(x_1)e^{ih^{-1}tA}\psi|_{t=T}\| = O(h^s) \tag{4.16}$$

with arbitrarily large s.

Proof. By making Fourier transform $F_{x'\to h^{-1}\xi'}$ we reduce the general case to $d = 1$ and operator B.

According to Proposition 4.2 $\|\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t)\psi_\gamma e^{ih^{-1}TA}\psi\| \le h^\delta$. Thus for $s = \delta'$ (4.16) has been proven (we reduce δ' if necessary).

Without any loss of the generality we assume that $\psi(x_1) = 1$ as $x_1 \le 1$, $\psi(x_1) = 0$ as $x_1 \ge 2$.

Observe that due to propagation as $t \le T$ and $x_1 \ge \gamma$ we see that $\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t)Q^+(hD_1)(1-\psi_\gamma)e^{ih^{-1}TA}\psi_\gamma$ is negligible where $Q^\pm \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is supported in $\{\pm\xi_1 > \epsilon\}$.

Furthermore, from the standard ellipticity arguments we conclude that $\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t)Q^0(hD_1)(1-\psi_\gamma)e^{ih^{-1}TA}\psi_\gamma$ is also negligible for $Q^0 \in \mathscr{C}_0^\infty([-2\epsilon, 2\epsilon])$.

Finally, due to propagation as $t \ge T$ and $x_1 \ge \gamma$ we conclude that $\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t)\psi_\gamma e^{ih^{-1}(t-T)A}Q^-(hD_1)(1-\psi_\gamma)e^{ih^{-1}TA}\psi_\gamma$ is negligible as $t \ge T$.

What is left is $\phi(\eta^{-1}hD_t)\psi_\gamma e^{ih^{-1}(t-T)A}Q^-(hD_1)\psi_\gamma e^{ih^{-1}TA}\psi_\gamma$ and since (4.16) holds for $s = \delta'$ we conclude that it holds for $s = 2\delta'$ and T replaced by $2T$.

Continuing this process we see that (4.16) holds for $s = n\delta'$ and T replaced by nT. Therefore, as we redenote nT by T (and T by T/n respectively), we acquire factor $(\gamma n/T)^n$ in our estimate and it is $O(h^s)$ for any s as h is sufficiently small, $\gamma/T \le h^\delta$ and $n = s/\delta'$. □

4.2 General case

Theorem 4.4. *Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{\xi})$ be a point on the energy level 1. Consider a Hamiltonian trajectory $\Psi_t(\bar{x}, \bar{\xi})$ with $\pm t \in [0, mT]$ (one sign only) with $T \ge \epsilon_0$ and assume that for each t indicated it meets ∂X transversally i.e.*

$$\mathsf{dist}(\pi_x\Psi_t(x,\xi), \partial X) \le \epsilon \implies |\frac{d}{dt}\mathsf{dist}(\pi_x\Psi_t(x,\xi), \partial X)| \ge \epsilon \qquad \forall t : \pm t \in [0, mT]. \tag{4.17}$$

Also assume that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\pi_x \Psi_t(x,\xi), \partial X) \ge \epsilon_0 \qquad \text{as} \quad t = 0,\ \pm t = mT. \tag{4.18}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a small enough constant, Q be supported in ϵ-vicinity of (x,ξ) and $Q_1 \equiv 1$ in $C_0\epsilon$-vicinity of $\Psi_t(x,\xi)$ as $t = \pm mT$. Then operator $(I - Q_1)e^{-ih^{-1}tH}Q$ is negligible as $t = \pm mT$.

Proof. (a) Obviously without any loss of the generality one can assume that there is just one reflection from ∂X (and this reflection is transversal) and that (3.1) is fulfilled in its vicinity.

Further, without any loss of the generality one can assume that Q is supported in ε-vicinity of $(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$, $Q_1 \equiv 1$ in ε-vicinity of $\Psi_{mT}(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$ and $T \asymp \varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon = h^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta'}$. Then both $\bar{x}$ and $\pi_x\Psi_{mT}(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$ belong to $C_0\varepsilon$-vicinity of ∂X.

Indeed, it follows from the propagation inside of domain.

(b) Then instead of isotropic vicinities we can consider anisotropic ones: ε with respect to (x',ξ'), $h^{1-3\delta'}$ with respect to x_1 and $h^{\delta'}$ with respect to ξ_1. Let now Q and Q_1 be corresponding operators.

In this framework from the propagation inside of domain it follows that without any loss of the generality one can assume that $T \asymp \gamma = h^{1-\delta''}$ and both $\bar{x}$ and $\pi_x\Psi_{mT}(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$ belong to $C_0\gamma$-vicinity of ∂X.

(c) Then one can employ the method of the successive approximations freezing coefficients at point $\bar{x}$ and in this case the statement of the theorem follows from the construction of Section 7.2 of [Ivr][2)] and Proposition 4.3. We leave easy details to the reader. □

Then we arrive immediately to

Corollary 4.5. *Under standard non-periodicity condition $\mathsf{N}^-(h)$ is given with $o(h^{1-d})$-error by the Tauberian expression with $T = h^{1-\delta}$.*

Proof. Easy details are left to the reader. □

[2)] Insignificant and rather obvious modifications are required.

5 Main results

5.1 From Tauberian to Weyl asymptotics

Now we can apply the method of successive approximations as described in Section 7.2 [2)] and prove that for operator A the Tauberian expression with $T = h^{1-\delta}$ (with sufficiently small $\delta > 0$) equals to Weyl expression $\mathsf{N}_h^{\mathsf{W}}$ with $O(h^{2-d-\delta''})$ error,

$$\mathsf{N}_h^{\mathsf{W}} = \kappa_0 h^{-d} + \kappa_{1,m} h^{1-d} + o(h^{1-m}) \tag{5.1}$$

with the standard coefficient $\kappa_0 = (2\pi)^{-d}\varpi_d \operatorname{vol}_d(X)$ and with

$$\kappa_{1,m} = (2\pi)^{1-d}\varpi_{d-1}\varkappa_m \operatorname{vol}_{d-1}(\partial X) \tag{5.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\varkappa_m &= \\ &= \frac{d-1}{m}\iint_1^\infty \lambda^{-(d-1)/m-1}\Big(\mathbf{e}_m(x_1,x_1,\lambda) - \pi^{-1}(\lambda-1)^{1/m}\Big)\,dx_1 d\lambda\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

with $\mathbf{e}_m(x_1,y_1,\tau) = \mathbf{e}_{m,1,1}(x_1,y_1,\tau)$ the Schwartz kernel of the spectral projector of operator $\mathbf{a}_m := B_{m,1,1}$ introduced by (4.1):

$$\mathbf{a}_m = ((D_x^2+1)^{m/2})_{\mathsf{D}} \tag{5.4}$$

Recall that vol_d and vol_{d-1} are Riemannian volumes corresponding to metrics g and its restriction to ∂X respectively and $\pi^{-1}(\lambda-1)^{1/m}$ is a Weyl approximation to $\mathbf{e}_{m,1}(x_1,x_1,\lambda)$.

Thus we arrive to

Theorem 5.1. *Under standard non-periodicity condition the following asymptotics holds:*

$$\mathsf{N}(\tau) = \kappa_0\tau^{\frac{d}{m}} + \kappa_{1,m}\tau^{\frac{d-1}{m}} + o(\tau^{\frac{d-1}{m}}) \qquad \text{as } \tau \to +\infty. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. First we establish as described above asymptotics

$$\mathsf{N}_h^- = \kappa_0 h^{-d} + \kappa_{1,m} h^{1-d} + o(h^{1-d}) \qquad \text{as } h \to +0 \tag{5.6}$$

which immediately implies (5.5) . □

5.2 Discussion

The following problems seem to be challenging

Problem 5.2. *As $m_1 > 0$, $m_2 > 0$ consider*

$$K = K_{m_1,m_2,X} := \Lambda_{m,X} - \Lambda_{m_1,X}\Lambda_{m_2,X} \tag{5.7}$$

on $\mathfrak{D}(\Lambda_m)$ with $m = m_1 + m_2$. From Corollary 6.2 we conclude that this is non-negative operator; obviously singularities of its Schwartz kernel $K(x,y)$ belong to $\partial X \times \partial X$. Prove that

(i) K a positive operator.

(ii) As $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0\}$ with Euclidean metrics its Schwartz kernel $K(x,y) = k(x_1, y_1, x' - y')$ which is positive homogeneous of degree $-m-d$ satisfies

$$|D_x^\alpha D_y^\beta K(x,y)| \le C_{\alpha\beta}(x_1+y_1)^{-m-\alpha_1-\beta_1}(x_1+y_1+|z|)^{-d-|\alpha'|+|\beta'|}. \tag{5.8}$$

(iii) In the general case in the local coordinates in which $X = \{x : x_1 > 0\}$ and $x_1 = \mathsf{dist}(x, \partial X)$ not only (5.8) holds but also

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_x^\alpha D_y^\beta \big(K(x,y) - K^0(x,y)\big)| \\ &\qquad \le C_{\alpha\beta}(x_1+y_1)^{-m-\alpha_1-\beta_1}(x_1+y_1+|z|)^{-d-|\alpha'|+|\beta'|+1} \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where $K^0(x,y) = k(x_1, y_1, x' - y')$ and $g^{jk} = \delta_{jk}$ at point $(0, \frac{1}{2}(x'+y'))$.

Problem 5.3. *As $m > 0$, $n > 0$ consider operator*

$$K = K_{m,n,X} := \Lambda_{m,X} - \Lambda_{n,X}^{m/n} \tag{5.10}$$

on $\mathfrak{D}(\Lambda_k)$ with $k = \max(m,n)$. Then this is non-negative (no-positive) operator as $m > n$ ($m < n$ respectively). Prove that

(i) K a positive (negative) operator as $n > m$ ($n < m$ respectively).

(ii) As $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > 0\}$ with Euclidean metrics its Schwartz kernel $K(x,y) = k(x_1, y_1, x' - y')$ which is positive homogeneous of degree $-m-d$ satisfies (5.8).

(iii) In the framework of Problem 5.2(iii) both (5.8) and (5.9) hold.

Problem 5.4. *(i) Consider operators* $(\Delta^{m/2})_{\mathsf{D}}$ *with* $m < 0$ *and the asymptotics of eigenvalues tending to* $+0$.

(ii) Consider operators with degenerations like $A_{m,X} = h^m \Lambda_{m,X} + V(x)$.

(iii) Consider more general operators where instead of Δ *general elliptic (matrix) operator is used.*

Problem 5.5. *(i) Consider Neumann boundary conditions: having smooth metrics* g *in the vicinity of* $\bar{X}$ *for each point* $x \notin X$ *in the vicinity of* ∂X *we can assign a mirror point* $j(x) \in \bar{X}$ *such that* x *and* $j(x)$ *are connected by a (short) geodesics orthogonal to* Y *at the point of intersection. Each* u *defined in* X *we can continue to the vicinity of* $\bar{X}$ *as* $Ju(x) = \psi(x)u(j(x))$ *with* ψ *supported in the vicinity of* $\bar{X}$ *and* $\psi = 1$ *in the smaller vicinity of* $\bar{X}$. *Then* $\Lambda_m u = R_X \Delta^{m/2} Ju$.

- *Establish eigenvalue asymptotics for this operator.*
- *Surely we need to prove that the choice neither of metrics outside of* X *nor* ψ *is important.*

(ii) One can also try $Ju(x) = -\psi(x)u(j(x))$ *and prove that eigenvalue asymptotics for this operator do not differ from what we got just for continuation by* 0.

Problem 5.6. *Consider manifolds with all geodesic billiards closed as in Section 8.3 of [Ivr]. To do this we need to calculate the "phase shift" at the transversal reflection point itself seems to be an extremely challenging problem.*

6 Appendices

6.A Variational estimates for fractional Laplacian

We follow here R. Frank and L. Geisinger [FG]. This is Lemma 19 and the next paragraph of their paper:

Lemma 6.1. *(i) Let B be a non-negative operator with $\operatorname{Ker} B = \{0\}$ and let P be an orthogonal projection. Then for any operator monotone function $\phi : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$,*

$$P\phi(PBP)P \geq P\phi(B)P. \tag{6.1}$$

(ii) If, in addition, B is positive definite and ϕ is not affine linear, then $\phi(PBP) = P\phi(B)P$ implies that the range of P is a reducing subspace of B.

We recall that, by definition, the range of P is a reducing subspace of a non-negative (possibly unbounded) operator if $(B+\tau)^{-1}\operatorname{Ran} P \subset \operatorname{Ran} P$ for some $\tau > 0$. We note that this is equivalent to $(B+\tau)^{-1}$ commuting with P, and we see that the definition is independent of τ since

$$\begin{aligned}&(B+\tau')^{-1}P - P(B+\tau')^{-1}\\ &\quad = (B+\tau)(B+\tau')^{-1}\left((B+\tau)^{-1}P - P(B+\tau)^{-1}\right)(B+\tau)(B+\tau')^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

We refer to the proof given there.

Corollary 6.2. *The following inequality holds*

$$\Lambda_{m,X} \leq \Lambda_{n,X}^{m/n} \qquad \text{as} \quad 0 < m < n. \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. Plugging into (6.1) $B = \Delta^{n/2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $P = \theta_X(x)$ and $\phi(\lambda) = \lambda^{m/n}$ we get (6.2). □

Repeating arguments of Proposition 20 and following it Subsection 6.4 of R. Frank and L. Geisinger [FG] (powers of operators will be different but also negative) we conclude that

Proposition 6.3. *Let $d \geq 2$. Then $-\varkappa_m$ is positive strictly monotone increasing function of $m > 0$.*

We leave details to the reader.

6.B μ-transmission property

Proposition 1 of G. Grubb [G2] claims that

Proposition 6.4. *A necessary and sufficient condition in order that* $R_X P u \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\bar{X})$ *for all* $u \in \mathscr{E}_\mu(\bar{X})$ *is that* P *satisfies the* μ-transmission condition *(in short: is of type* μ*), namely that*

$$\partial_x^\beta \partial_\xi^\alpha p_j(x,-N) = e^{\pi i(m-2\mu-j-|\alpha|)} \partial_x^\beta \partial_\xi^\alpha p_j(x,N) \qquad \forall x \in \partial\Omega, \tag{6.3}$$

for all j, α, β*, where* N *denotes the interior normal to* ∂X *at* x*,* m *is an order of classical pseudo-differential operator* P *and for* $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ *with* $\mathsf{Re}\,\mu > -1$*.*

Here $\mathscr{E}_\mu(\bar{X})$ denotes the space of functions u such that $u = E_X d(x)^\mu v$ with $v \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\bar{X})$ where E_X is an operator of extension by 0 to $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus X$ and $d(x) = \mathsf{dist}(x, \partial X)$.

Observe that for $\mu = 0$ we have an ordinary transmission property (see Definition 1.4.3).

7 Global theory

Let us discuss fractional Laplacians defined by (1.1) in domain $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then under additional condition

$$\mathsf{dist}(x,y) \le C_0|x-y| \qquad \forall x, y \in X \tag{7.1}$$

(where $\mathsf{dist}(x,y)$ is a "connected" distance between x and y) everything seems to work. We leave to the reader.

Problem 7.1. *Under assumption (11.3.54) of [Ivr]*

(i) prove Lieb-Cwikel-Rozeblioum estimate (9.A.11) of [Ivr].

(ii) Restore results of Chapter 9 of [Ivr].

(iii) Reconsider examples of Sections 11.2 and 11.3 of [Ivr].

Remark 7.2. Obviously domains with cuts and inner spikes (inner angles of 2π) do not fit (7.1). On the other hand in the case of the domain with the cut due to non-locality of Δ^r with $r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ both sides of the cut "interact" and at least coefficient in the second term of two-term asymptotics may be wrong; in the case of the inner spike some milder effects are expected.



(a) (b)

Figure 1: Domain with a cut (a) and an inner spike (b).

The following problem seems to be very challenging:

Problem 7.3. *(i) Investigate fractional Laplacians in domains with cuts and inner spikes and save whatever is possible.*

(ii) Generalize these results to higher dimensions.

Comments

To my surprise I learned that fractional Laplacians are of the interest to probability theory: which seem to be of interest to probability theory starting from R. M. Blumenthal, R. M. and R. K. Getoor [BG] and then by R. Bañuelos and T. Kulczycki [BK], R. Bañuelos, T. Kulczycki and B. Siudeja. [BKS], M. Kwaśnicki [K].

Those operators were formulated in the framework of stochastic processes and thus were not accessible for me until I found paper R. Frank and L. Geisinger [FG] provided definition we follow here. They showed that the trace has a two-term expansion regardless of dynamical assumptions[3)], and the second term in their expansion paper [FG] defined by (3.2)–(3.3) is closely related to $\kappa_{1,m}$.

Furthermore I learned that one-term asymptotics for more general operators (albeit without remainder estimate) was obtained by G. Grubb [G3].

[3)] The fact that R. Frank and L. Geisinger obtain a second term regardless of dynamical assumptions is simply due to the fact that they study $\mathsf{Tr}(f(\Lambda_{m,X}))$ with $f(\lambda) = -\lambda\theta(-\lambda)$, which is one order smoother than $f(\lambda) = \theta(-\lambda)$.

I express my gratitudes to G. Grubb and R. Frank for pointing to rather nasty errors in the previous version and very useful comments and R. Bañuelos for very useful comments.

Bibliography

[BK] R. Bañuelos and T. Kulczycki, Trace estimates for stable processes, Probab. Theory Related Fields 142:313–338 (2008).

[BKS] R. Bañuelos., T. Kulczycki T. and B. Siudeja., On the trace of symmetric stable processes on Lipschitz domains. J. Funct. Anal. 257(10):3329–3352 (2009).

[BG] R. M. Blumenthal and R. K. Getoor, Sample functions of stochastic processes with stationary independent increments. J. Math. Mech., 10:493-516 (1961).

[FG] R. Frank, and L. Geisinger, Refined Semiclassical asymptotics for fractional powers of the Laplace operator. arXiv 1105.5181 (2013)
.

[G1] G. Grubb, Local and nonlocal boundary conditions for μ-transmission and fractional elliptic pseudodifferential operators, Analysis and Part. Diff. Equats., 7(71):649–1682 (2014).

[G2] G. Grubb, Fractional Laplacians on domains, a development of Hörmander's theory of μ-transmission pseudodifferential operators, Adv. Math. 268:478-528 (2015).

[G3] G. Grubb, Spectral results for mixed problems and fractional elliptic operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 421(2):1616–1634 (2015).

[GH] G. Grubb and L. Hörmander, The transmission property Math. Scand., 67:273289 (1990).

[Ivr] Victor Ivrii, Microlocal Analysis and Sharp Spectral Asymptotics, in progress: available online at
http://www.math.toronto.edu/ivrii/futurebook.pdf

[K] M. Kwaśnicki, Eigenvalues of the fractional laplace operator in the interval. J. Funct. Anal., 262(5):2379–2402 (2012).